1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
9		
10	MARTHA SALDIVAR,	Case No.: 2:18-cv-00672-JCM-NJK
11	Plaintiff(s),	ORDER
12	v.	(Docket No. 16)
13	ALBERTSON'S LLC, et al.,	
14		
15	Defendant(s).	
16		
17	Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulation to extend discovery deadlines, filed or	
18	August 14, 2018. Docket No. 16. The parties submit that an extension is warranted because they	
19	must evaluate treatment records from seventeen healthcare providers and have had conflicts in	
20	scheduling depositions. <i>Id.</i> at 2.	
21	Parties are required to diligently conduct discovery, unless a stay has been granted. The	
22	Court granted the parties' joint proposed discovery plan and scheduling order on July 17, 2018	
23	Docket No. 12. To date, however, the parties submit that the only discovery completed is the	
24	exchange of initial disclosures and the scheduling of one deposition. Docket No. 16 at 2. The	
25	Court therefore finds that the parties have failed to show diligence in conducting discovery.	
26	//	
27	//	
28	//	
	.l	

Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** the parties' stipulation to extend discovery deadlines without prejudice. Docket No. 16. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: August 20, 2018 NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge ¹ The parties request, *inter alia*, an extension of the deadlines to amend pleadings from July 12, 2018, to September 10, 2018, and the initial expert disclosure/interim status report from August 13, 2018, to October 12, 2018. Docket No. 16 at 2. Local Rule IA 6-1 requires that a request for extension made after the expiration of a deadline must be supported by excusable neglect. The parties have failed to address, let alone show, excusable neglect for the extension of the expired

deadlines. Any renewed request for extensions shall address excusable neglect for any expired

deadlines that the parties ask to revive.